IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Civil Application no. 954 of 2006
in
Second Appeal no. 687 of 1997

Sadashiv Dondiram Sali & others .....Petitioners

Versus

Sahadu Dagadu Sarode .....Respondent

Mr. J. N. Pawar, Advocate for Petitioner
Mr. Anilkumar K. Patil, Advocate for Respondents

Coram: Anoop V. Mohta, J

Dated: 4th May, 2007

P.C.

Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that admittedly when order was passed on 16-12-2005, the Advocate for the appellant was not present. Though the matter was on Board on 15-12-2005, it was heard and kept on 16-12-2005 yet none appeared for the appellant again, therefore, after hearing both the parties the impugned order came to be passed. The findings given by both the Courts as observed need to be maintained even

after hearing the learned counsel for the appellant in the present writ Petition.

2. There is no substantial question of law as such. Considering this there is no substance in the present review petition. It is, therefore, dismissed.

(Anoop V. Mohta,J)